



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/584,306	05/31/2000	Eric James	99EC035/77526	3172

7590 04/25/2003  
Welsh & Katz LTD  
22nd Floor  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/584,306

Applicant(s)

JAMES, ERIC

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 2/10/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. Claims 1, 2, 23, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clare et al. (U.S. Patent 5,465,286).

Regarding claim 1, Clare teaches automatically monitoring entities in a call center (col. 11, lines 50-54); selecting an entity in the call center (col. 10, lines 17-22); modifying configuration information (col. 12, lines 26-30) through a workstation of a supervisor (Fig. 1, 20).

Regarding claims 2 and 23, Clare teaches monitoring physical location information of entities and updating the electronic floor plan to provide and reflect a change in physical location information of the entities (col. 12, lines 26-64); displaying the electronic floor plan on the workstation of the supervisor (Fig. 1, 20 and Abstract, lines 3-12).

Regarding claims 44 and 45, Clare teaches the steps of: an entity monitor comprises a programmable computer which monitors entities for physical location information to provide an electronic floor plan (col. 12, line 65 through col. 13, line 21); a supervisors workstation that displays the electronic floor plan (Abstract, lines 3-12); and an informer that updates the electronic floor plan displayed on the supervisors workstation to provide and reflect changes in physical location information of the entities (col. 13, line 46 through col. 14, line 32).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2642

3. Claims 4, 6-13, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 26-34, 37, 38, 40-43, 46, and 48-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clare et al. (U.S. Patent 5,465,286).

Regarding claims 4, 24 and 46, Clare teaches entities includes agent/personnel (Fig. 13, 61), consoles/agent terminals (col. 11, lines 61-63). Clare does not teach printers and facsimile. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that any working station would have at least a printer and facsimile to better serve customers.

Regarding claims 6, 26 and 48, Clare teaches monitoring ("updated") the changes (col. 11, lines 50-60). However, Clare does not teach comparing physical location at a second time with physical location at a first time. It would be necessary to compare the physical location at a second time with the physical location at a first time in order to display the updated information.

Regarding claims 7, 27 and 49, Clare does not teach notifying a supervisor if the physical location information has been changed. It would have been obvious that one of the purposes of monitoring physical location of an entity in a call center is to notify the supervisor.

Regarding claims 8, 28, and 37, Clare teaches recording physical location information and retrieving the recorded physical location information (col. 10, lines 32-51). Clare does not teach physical location information that is improper is maintained in a list of entities without physical location information. It would have been obvious that physical location information are not needed for improper location information, for example, there is no graphical image display on the electronic floor plan for an entity if an entity is located at an improper location.

Regarding claims 9, 10, 29, and 30, Clare does not teach the physical location is entered by a call center user or server computer. In Clare's system, the receiver/sensor and transmitter

Art Unit: 2642

automatically recorded the physical location; otherwise, it would have been obvious that the physical location needed to be entered.

Claims 11 and 31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 5 and 8.

Regarding claims 12, 32, and 33, Clare teaches the recorded physical location information is determined by getting physical location information from a database (Fig. 1, memory in applications processor 50).

Regarding claims 13, 17, 18, 34, 38, and 52, Clare does not teach translating includes using a look-up table to create a relationship between physical location information and graphical form and placing graphical image and using bit map drawing tools to produce two-dimensional image of the electronic floor plan. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that looking-up a table to create a relationship between physical information and graphical form, graphical image in order to provide proper and accurate drawing.

Regarding claims 20 and 40, Clare teaches the locating system updates the location information every one second/in near real time. It would have been obvious that the locating system would have identified an entity, which has physically moved in order to update the location information.

Regarding claims 21, 41, and 22, 42, 43, 50, Clare does not teach the electronic floor plan is updated with a prediction of physical location information based upon a history of physical location information and is archived and retrieved for later analysis. It would have been very useful in call center environment that prediction of physical location information based upon a

Art Unit: 2642

history of physical location information and is archived and retrieved for later analysis in order to assist supervisor in planning.

Claim 51 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 11.

4. Claims 3, 5, 14-16, 19, 25, 35, 36, 39, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clare et al. (U.S. Patent 5,465,286) in view of Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,268,872).

Regarding claims 3, 14, 15, 35, and 36, Clare does not teach physical location information includes Cartesian coordinates, latitude and longitude meridians, and radius vector and angle and proper Cartesian coordinates can be graphically represented on the electronic floor plan.

Matsuda et al. teach a three-dimensional graphics language called Virtual Reality Modeling Language (VRML) that enables description of a three-dimensional space and setting of objects drawn in three-dimensional graphics; furthermore if entity 61 in Fig. 13 moves from one location to the next location, the Cartesian coordinates would change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Cartesian coordinates would be needed for proper graphically representation of the electronic floor plan.

Claims 5, 19, 25, 39, and 47 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 3, 14, 15, 35, and 36. Furthermore, Clare teaches electronic floor plan includes a bit map image (col. 10, lines 37-51).

Art Unit: 2642

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that vector graphics, object oriented graphics, and VRML browser are used for displaying a three-dimensional space and the advantage of using them are also well known.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 37.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusions***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.


Art Unit: 2642

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen  
April 17, 2003

  
AHMAD MATAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600